

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the Office Action of October 22, 2004, and offers the following remarks to accompany the above amendments.

Applicant herein cancels claims 1-49 mooted the objection thereto and the rejections thereof.

Applicant presents new claims 50-69, including 4 independent claims. As Applicant has already paid for 8 independent claims, no new fee should be required. Support for the new claims can be found in original claims 1, 2, 6, and 8, and in the specification at page 3, lines 8-24. No new matter is added.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 28, 35, 39, 40, 41, 44, 46 and 49 were objected to because of the order of sequence steps. The newly presented claims have no reference characters and thus, this objection is moot.

Claims 1-28 and 33-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Brennan et al. (hereinafter "Brennan"). Claims 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brennan in view of McConnell. As Applicant has canceled the rejected claims, these rejections are moot.

The new claims recite that there are three types of entities within a plurality of entities. The three types are offices entities, group entities, and subscriber entities. The claims further recite that once the office feature queue is defined for an office entity, at least one group associated with the office inherits the office feature queue to form a group feature queue. The group feature queue may then be modified to customize it to the needs of the group. Likewise, at least one subscriber inherits the group feature queue to form the subscriber feature queue, which in turn maybe modified to fit the needs of the subscriber. In this manner, the hierarchical relationship between the feature queues is presented.

The references of record do not teach this inheritance function from the office to the group to the subscriber. Some of this subject matter was originally presented in claim 8. The Patent Office's analysis of claim 8 does not indicate where in the references this inheritance function can be found. To this extent, the references do not teach or suggest the claim element, and the claims are allowable.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections in light of the amendments and remarks presented herein. Applicant earnestly solicits claim allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By: 

Benjamin S. Withrow
Registration No. 40,876
P.O. Box 1287
Cary, NC 27512
Telephone: (919) 654-4520

Date: February 15, 2005
Attorney Docket: 7000-043

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING
TRANSMITTED VIA FACSIMILE ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW
TO:

Examiner: Le, Karen L. Art Unit: 2642 Fax: 703-872-9306

REBECCA ROOKS

Name of Sender

Rebecca Rooks

Signature

2/15/05

Date of Transmission